

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2016

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 09 May 2016**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/Q1445/D/15/3141133**

### **165 Cowley Drive, Woodingdean, Brighton BN2 6TE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Handley against the decision of Brighton & Hove City Council.
  - The application, Ref. BH2015/02277, dated 19 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2015.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to the existing dwellinghouse to facilitate a ground floor disabled bedroom & en-suite accommodation.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair with the house to the west and has a flank to the junction of Cowley Drive with Littleworth Close, a cul-de-sac. Both of these factors are relevant to my appraisal of the appeal application.
  4. On the first point there are differences between the front elevations of each house in the pair, in particular the attached garage at the adjoining property. However, there is a pleasing symmetry and balance between each house and the overall appearance of the building as a whole would be harmed by the proposed two story extension, especially as the extension would not be set back at first floor level. This would be contrary to the Council's SPD12 Design Guide for Extensions and Alterations 2013 and have a harmful impact on the existing building and the Cowley Drive street scene.
  5. On the second point, the Design Guide says that on corner plots a sufficient gap should be left between the extension and the site boundary so as not to appear intrusive, and that two storey extensions need to leave more of a gap to the boundary than single storey additions so as to avoid a cramped and dominant appearance.
-

6. However, in this case only a minimal gap would remain between the side wall of the extension and the back of the footpath in Littleworth Close and I consider that the result would be one of the extended building closing down the openness at the junction and appearing unduly intrusive in the street scene. I saw on my visit that No. 169 on the opposite side of Littleworth Close has had an extension to the side. However, this is set down from the main ridge of the original dwelling and leaves a reasonable gap to the pavement.
7. I have taken careful account of the grounds of appeal relating to the initial contact with the Council and the personal circumstances of the appellants, which require the accommodation sought in the proposed development. However whilst I have sympathy with the points raised I am unable to give them more weight than the permanent harmful effects on the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed. The proposed extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. This would be in harmful conflict with Policy QD14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005; the Council's SPD12 guidance, and Government policy in Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR